

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Clear Form

SUSAN HURTADO, individually and on
behalf of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff(s),

CASE NO. 11-03156 PJH

v.

Ikea U.S. West, Inc.

Defendant(s).

STIPULATION AND ~~PROPOSED~~
ORDER SELECTING ADR PROCESS

Counsel report that they have met and conferred regarding ADR and have reached the following stipulation pursuant to Civil L.R. 16-8 and ADR L.R. 3-5:

The parties agree to participate in the following ADR process:

Court Processes:

- ☐ Non-binding Arbitration (ADR L.R. 4)
- ☐ Early Neutral Evaluation (ENE) (ADR L.R. 5)
- ☐ Mediation (ADR L.R. 6)

(Note: Parties who believe that an early settlement conference with a Magistrate Judge is appreciably more likely to meet their needs than any other form of ADR, must participate in an ADR phone conference and may not file this form. They must instead file a Notice of Need for ADR Phone Conference. See Civil Local Rule 16-8 and ADR L.R. 3-5)

Private Process:

- ☒ Private ADR (*please identify process and provider*)

The parties believe that mediation may be appropriate in the future; however, given the complexities of a class action case, further discovery and litigation need to be completed before the parties are able to discuss ADR.

The parties agree to hold the ADR session by:

- ☐ the presumptive deadline (*The deadline is 90 days from the date of the order referring the case to an ADR process unless otherwise ordered.*)

- ☒ other requested deadline June 30, 2012: after classwide discovery and certification motion

Dated: 9/20/2011

/s/ Hallie Von Rock

Attorney for Plaintiff

Dated: 9/20/2011

Kenneth Kawabata

Attorney for Defendant

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE